BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2003-133-C - ORDER NO. 2003-622

OCTOBER 20, 2003

IN RE:	Application of OneLink Communications,)	ORDER DENYING
	Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience)	APPLICATION VV
	and Necessity to resell Intrastate)	WITHOUT PREJUDICE
	Telecommunications Services within the State)	
	of South Carolina.)	

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) by way of an Application from OneLink Communications, Inc. (OneLink) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to provide intrastate resold telecommunications services in the State of South Carolina. A hearing was held regarding OneLink's Application on September 4, 2003, in the Commission's Hearing Room. The Honorable Randy Mitchell, Vice Chairman, presided. OneLink was represented by Faye A. Flowers, Esquire. Jocelyn G. Boyd, Staff Counsel, represented the Commission Staff.

The Commission's Executive Director instructed OneLink to publish a prepared Notice of Filing in newspapers of general circulation in the areas affected by the Application. The purpose of the Notice of Filing was to provide notice of the Application to any interested parties and to advise interested parties of the manner and time in which to file pleadings to participate in the docket. OneLink filed Affidavits of Publication as

proof that it had complied with the instructions of the Executive Director. The Commission did not receive any Petitions to Intervene regarding the instant Application.

We have examined the record in this case, and we find that the Company's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity should be denied. Ms. Janice Cash, Regulatory Manager for OneLink, appeared and testified on behalf of the Company. The financial, technical, and managerial resources of a potential telecommunications company are required information of companies seeking to operate in this State, and this Commission is obligated to inquire about these resources of a company during certification hearings. However, the witness was not prepared to answer pertinent questions regarding the Company's financial and technical resources. For example, after being asked questions about the Company's financial statements, the witness responded that the financial aspect of the Company is not her area. With regard to technical information, the witness could not answer questions related to technical resources without prompting by counsel, and further, the witness could not provide the name of OneLink's underlying carrier without being prompted by counsel.

In order to adequately assess a company's ability to provide telecommunications services in South Carolina, this Commission must be provided sufficient financial, technical, and managerial information about the company, and witnesses who are prepared to answer questions regarding the financial, technical, and managerial resources of the company should be present at the formal hearing. In this case, the witness for OneLink could not provide the Commission with sufficient information regarding

OneLink's resources and abilities to provide telecommunications services in South Carolina.

Therefore, OneLink's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Mignon J. Clyburn Chairman

ATTEST:

Bruce F. Duke

Deputy Executive Director

(SEAL)